

Remarks

New claim 4 includes the limitations of original claim 1 with the added language "wherein the composition provides hydrophobic surface treatment to a glass surface treated with the composition". A basis for this language can be found at page 5, lines 14-20 and page 6, lines 9-10 and lines 14-15 of the specification. New claim 5 includes the limitations of original claim 2 and the same language that was added to claim 4. New claim 6 corresponds to original claim 3. In view of the amendment above and the arguments below, reconsideration is respectfully requested with respect to pending claims 1-6.

Original claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. patent 4,732,858 to Brewer *et al.* The Brewer *et al.* patent was cited as teaching a composition having organosilanes and various glycol ether solvents. The Brewer *et al.* composition is described as being an adhesion promoter particularly useful in producing microelectronic components (see column 2, lines 30-35 of Brewer *et al.*). In contrast, the inventor has surprisingly discovered that the claimed composition provides hydrophobic surface treatment to a glass surface treated with the composition. Brewer *et al.* does not teach or suggest the use of the Brewer *et al.* composition for the hydrophobic surface treatment of a glass surface. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that pending claims 1-6 are patentable over Brewer *et al.*

Original claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by, and original claim 3 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 4,455,541 to Hanisch. The Hanisch patent was cited as teaching organosilane esters having glycol ether moieties, and in particular

Example 1 of Hanisch was noted in the Office Action. The Hanisch composition is described as being a sealing composition particularly useful in polyurethane sealing compositions (see column 1, lines 61-65 of Hanisch). In contrast, the inventor has discovered that the claimed composition provides hydrophobic surface treatment to a glass surface treated with the composition. Hanisch does not teach or suggest the use of the Hanisch composition for the hydrophobic surface treatment of a glass surface. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that pending claims 1-6 are patentable over Hanisch.

Original claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by, and original claim 3 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 4,908,065 to Tanitsu *et al.* Comparative Example 1 of Tanitsu *et al.* was cited as describing a composition including tetraethoxysilane and ethylene glycol monoethyl ether. The Tanitsu *et al.* composition is described as being a coating solution for a metal oxide film, and is particularly suited for forming metal oxide films on plastic, glass, metal and ceramic substrates (see column 6, lines 49-56 of Tanitsu *et al.*). In contrast, the inventor has discovered that the claimed composition provides hydrophobic surface treatment to a glass surface treated with the composition. Tanitsu *et al.* does not teach or suggest the use of the Tanitsu *et al.* composition for the hydrophobic surface treatment of a glass surface. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that pending claims 1-6 are patentable over Tanitsu *et al.*

Original claims 1 to 3 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. patent 5,514,211 to Marks *et al.* Example 3, composition (e) of Marks *et al.* was cited as describing a composition including ethyl silicate (also

known as tetraethyl orthosilicate, $\text{Si}(\text{OC}_2\text{H}_5)_4$) and propylene glycol monobutyl ether. The Marks *et al.* composition is described as being a pretreatment solution for a solid surface, and is particularly suited for increasing the adhesion of subsequent coatings (e.g., paint) to metals (see column 1, lines 8-14 of Marks *et al.*). In contrast, the inventor has discovered that the claimed composition provides hydrophobic surface treatment to a glass surface treated with the composition. Marks *et al.* does not teach or suggest the use of the Marks *et al.* composition for the hydrophobic surface treatment of a glass surface. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that pending claims 1-6 are patentable over Marks *et al.*


Original claims 1 to 3 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 5,008,153 to Hayes *et al.* Examples 1 to 5 of Hayes *et al.* were cited as describing compositions including certain trialkoxysilanes and an ethanol carrier, and the Office Action stated it would be obvious to select propylene glycol monobutyl ether from column 3, line 24 of Hayes *et al.* as an alternative carrier. The Hayes *et al.* composition is described as being a pretreatment solution for a solid surface, and is particularly suited as a pretreatment solution for thin metallic films, such as silver, which are applied to substrates such as glass (see column 1, lines 10-13 of Hayes *et al.*). In contrast, the inventor has discovered that the claimed composition provides hydrophobic surface treatment to a glass surface treated with the composition. Hayes *et al.* does not teach or suggest the use of the Hayes *et al.* composition for the hydrophobic surface treatment of a glass surface. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that pending claims 1-6 are patentable over Hayes *et al.*

Conclusion

Therefore, pending claims 1-6 are believed to be patentable over the cited patents, and allowance is respectfully requested. Attached is a fee sheet for the extension fee and the extra independent claim. No other fees are believed to be required for entry of this amendment. However, should any additional fees be needed, please charge Deposit Account No. 17-0055 for the amount of the fees.

Respectfully submitted,
Richard W. Avery

Dated: May 15, 2003

By: 
Richard T. Roche
Registration No. 38,599
Quarles and Brady LLP
411 East Wisconsin Ave.
Milwaukee, WI 53202
(414) 277-5805